

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6
7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 MICHAEL NILSEN,

10 Plaintiff,

No. C 17-04175 WHA

11 v.

12 JUDGE ANDREW BLUM, *et al.*,

**ORDER RE AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

13 Defendants.
14 _____/

15 On September 21, *pro se* plaintiff Michael Nilsen filed an untimely amended complaint
16 without leave of the Court. Nevertheless, all arguments made in defendants' motion to dismiss
17 still have applicability to the amended complaint. The changes in the amended complaint being
18 insignificant, the hearing on the motion to dismiss will proceed as scheduled, with the
19 arguments in the motion to dismiss applied to the amended complaint.

20 As stated in an earlier order, Nilsen shall file a response to the motion to dismiss by
21 **SEPTEMBER 27**. If he fails to do so, the complaint will be **DISMISSED**.

22 In the event that plaintiff files a response, defendants shall have until **OCTOBER 3** to file
23 their reply. The hearing on the motion remains unchanged.
24

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
26

27 Dated: September 25, 2017.
28



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE